

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application and the rejection of claims 1, 4, 5, 7-10, 12, 15-18 and 20 are respectfully requested. Applicant has attempted to address every objection and ground for rejection in the Office Action dated August 11, 2005 (Paper No. 20050726) and believes the application is now in condition for allowance. The claims have been amended to more clearly describe the present invention. The Specification has been amended to correct typographical and grammatical errors. No new matter has been added to the application.

The Specification stands objected to because of minor informalities. Specifically, the Examiner submits that lines 1-2 on page 16 should read "section (10) of the body." Applicant has made the required correction. Furthermore, the Examiner contends that lines 6-7 on page 16 refer to "the securing apparatus (1) in Figure 5," but there is no such reference number in Figure 5. Accordingly, Applicant has amended Figure 5 to include reference number (1), and the objections to the Specification are respectfully traversed.

Claims 17, 18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Applicant has canceled claims 17 and 18 and therefore considers this rejection moot.

With respect to claim 20, the Examiner is unclear whether the Applicant is claiming solely the tool or the tool in combination with the securing apparatus. Accordingly, Applicant has amended claim 20 to recite, among other things, “a securing apparatus as claimed in claim 1 wherein the releasing tool contains...” Applicant submits that it is clear that claim 20 claims solely the releasing tool of the securing apparatus. Therefore, Applicant respectfully contends that amended claim 20 clearly defines the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, the rejection based on Section 112 is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7-10, 12, 16-18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Howard (U.S. Pat. No. 3,473,202). Howard discloses a shaft-gripping element including a collar A and thin splint sleeve B. The collar A has a slot 12, leaving two adjacent faces 11 and 11', where face 11 has a threaded aperture 13 configured to threadably receive a screw 14. When the screw 14 is turned into the aperture 13, it makes contact with the slot face 11' and expands slot 12. (Col. 2, ll. 33-46 and 64-66; FIG. 1).

In contrast, amended claim 1 recites, among other things, “wherein the securing apparatus is only unlocked by the operation of the releasing tool with respect to the body and remains locked at all other times, where the securing apparatus is fully unlocked by the operation of the releasing tool with respect to the body and is locked at all other times upon removal of the releasing tool.” Applicant submits that Howard fails to disclose all of the features recited in amended claim 1. Specifically, the releasing tool or screw 14 in Howard is not

removed from the collar A, but instead is retained in the collar during use to adjust tension on the unit when the screw is turned, either expanding or contracting the collar. In contrast, the presently claimed releasing tool is fully removable from the securing apparatus, locking the securing apparatus when it is removed.

Further, in contrast to Howard, where there are intermediate steps in which the unit is only partially locked due to the threading of the releasing tool, in the present invention, the securing apparatus is either fully locked or fully unlocked, depending on whether or not the releasing tool is inserted. Accordingly, in view of Howard's failure to disclose the structures now recited in the amended claims, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1, 4, 5, 7-10, 12, 16-18 and 20 under §102(b).

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Howard. The arguments stated above traversing Howard are reasserted here. Applicant submits that Howard fails to disclose or suggest all of the features recited in amended claim 1, from which claim 15 depends. Applicant further submits that in view of the amendments made to claim 1, claim 15 is in allowable form. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 15 under §103(a).

In view of the above amendments, the application is respectfully submitted to be in allowable form. Allowance of the rejected claims is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner discover there are remaining issues which may be

Serial No.: 10/768,344
Filed: January 30, 2004

resolved by a telephone interview, he is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By 
Rebecca L. Uryga
Registration No. 53,713

Customer No. 24978

November 14, 2005
Suite 2500
300 S. Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6501
Telephone: (312) 360-0080
Facsimile: (312) 360-9315

Serial No.: 10/768,344
Filed: January 30, 2004

IN THE DRAWINGS:

Please replace the previously filed Figure 5 with the attached,
amended Figure 5.

Fig 5

